

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 currently appear in this application. The Office Action of July 13, 2007, has been carefully studied. These claims define novel and unobvious subject matter under Sections 102 and 103 of 35 U.S.C., and therefore should be allowed. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration, entry of the present amendment, and formal allowance of the claims

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The phrase "Use of a compound..." is written in improper format.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 9-12 have been rewritten as method claims in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestion.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. In the Information Disclosure Statement submitted February 6, 2006, documents AA and AB specifically discussed differential

inhibition of aminopeptidase A. Therefore, one skilled in the art knew that compounds could be developed that would inhibit aminopeptidase A. Tables 1 and 2 on page 59 of the application as filed demonstrate that a variety of the compounds prepared were effective in inhibiting aminopeptidase A. Documents AA and AB, submitted with the February 6 Information Disclosure Statement, note that aminopeptidase A is associated with metabolism of angiotensins.

As noted in the specification beginning on page 5, line 5, the compounds claimed herein are useful for treating diseases to which arterial hypertension directly or indirectly contributes. One skilled in the art can readily determine what diseases are directly or indirectly related to arterial hypertension. New claims 13-20 have been submitted in order to claim methods for treating specific diseases using the herein claimed compounds.

Oath/Declaration

The declaration is said to be defective because it is not written in English. The Examiner has cited MPEP Sections 602.01 and 602.02. There is nothing in these sections that requires that a declaration be in English. 37 CFR 1.63(a) also has no requirement that the declaration be in English.

Appln. No. 10/567,362
Amd. dated November 13, 2007
Reply to Office Action of July 13, 2007

It would be appreciated if the Examiner would point out where is the requirement for the declaration to be in English.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: /Anne M. Kornbau/
Anne M. Kornbau
Registration No. 25,884

AMK:srd
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\R\RINU\Roques1\Pto\2007-11-13AMD.doc